

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-18 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 12, and 19 are canceled by the present response without prejudice.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11-14, 16, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,437,786 to Yasukawa. Claims 2, 8, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yasukawa as applied to claims 1, 7, and 14, and further in view of JP 5-216885 to Iwamoto. Claims 4, 10, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yasukawa as applied to claims 3, 9, and 16, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,987,323 to Huotari.

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note each of the claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now recites “the image files being given in advance prescribed priority levels based on attributes of the image files”. Independent claim 1 now also further recites that the storing state changing unit is configured “to select image files of which storing states are to be changed according to the priority levels”. Similar features were recited for example in dependent claim 6, although claim 1 now clarifies such features. The other independent claims are similarly amended as in independent claim 1 noted above. The features recited in the claims as currently written are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

First, with respect to features such as recited for example in original dependent claim 6, the outstanding rejection only cited the teachings in Yasukawa, and particularly cited Yasukawa at column 13, lines 11-29. The basis for the rejection also states “[w]hile Yasukawa is silent as to how unnecessary data is defined, the system must inherently process

at least one attribute of the unnecessary data files in order to determine that they are indeed unnecessary".¹

The above-noted basis for the outstanding rejection is not believed to address the features recited in the claims as currently written.

In the claims as currently written prescribed priority levels are given in advance to image files based on attributes of the image files.

With such a claimed feature, when a monitoring unit detects that one image file that is currently received or scheduled to be received from a transmitting side apparatus cannot be stored in a storage device, the monitoring unit can determine which of the image files that have already been stored in the storage device has to be subject to a storing state change based on such priority levels. With such a configuration, a least necessary image file at a time of receiving another image file can be subject to changing its storing state. Thereby, necessary image files that are not yet displayed for an audience of a presentation or that need to be re-displayed do not have to be subjected to a storing state change. That provides the benefit of reducing the risk of any image degradation or re-transmission of necessary images.

Thus, in the claims as currently written the image files are given prescribed priority levels in advance based on attributes of the image files. No disclosure in Yasukawa at column 13, lines 11-29 is directed to such features.

At column 13, lines 11-29 Yasukawa merely indicates that unnecessary data can be deleted. Yasukawa, however, does not disclose or address any operation in which an advance priority level is given to image files based on attributes of the image files. Yasukawa does not disclose any operation of selecting an image file to be subjected to a storing state change in accordance with such priority levels given in advance to image files based on attributes of the image files.

¹ Office Action of April 19, 2005, page 3, third full paragraph.

Moreover, processing at least one attribute of unnecessary data files as in Yasukawa, which is the basis for the rejection, would not result in image files being given in advance prescribed priority levels based on attributes of the image files. Thus, there is nothing inherent in Yasukawa that meets the above-noted claim limitations.

In such ways, each of the claims as currently written is believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings in Yasukawa.

Moreover, no teachings in the further secondary cited references to Iwamoto or Huotari are cited with respect to or overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Yasukawa.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
EHK/SS:aif

I:\ATTY\SNS\21's\218865\218865US-AM.DOC